

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-11 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 6 being the independent claims. Support for the subject matter of the amended claims is contained in the application as originally filed. Because the foregoing changes introduce no new matter, their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant thanks the Examiner for consideration of the references submitted by Information Disclosure Statement on August 12, 2005.

Claims Objections

The Examiner made objections to claims 4 and 9-11 as being in improper multiple dependent form. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 4 and 9-11 is overcome by the accompanying amendment thereto. Additionally, claims 1, 4, 6, and 9 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***Claims 1-5***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,111,523 to Mee ("Mee") and U.S. Patent No. 6,515,596 to Awada ("Awada"). Mee and Awada, taken individually or combined, fail to teach or suggest the method of the present invention including periodically transmitting a synchronization signal which forms an indication of the exact time, as is called for by claim 1.

Claim 1 calls for a method for synchronizing a clock including periodically transmitting a synchronization signal to a traffic monitoring system wherein the signal forms an indication of the exact time. As set out in the second paragraph of the description, on page 1, lines 11 to 26, the present application addresses the problem of the synchronization of an internal clock in a traffic monitoring system with the real, exact time in the outside world. This is of crucial importance since traffic monitoring systems that are used for detecting traffic violations will make recordings in which the place and time of the offence is included. Errors or lack of clarity in recording of the place and time of the offense can have the result that prosecution of the offender becomes impossible. Therefore, it is important that the internal clock of the traffic monitoring system be synchronised with the real time periodically.

In contrast, the problem of ensuring an accurate time of a traffic monitoring system is neither discussed nor suggested by Mee. Instead, Mee is directed to a system for producing an accurate photographic record of a vehicle at an intersection. *See, e.g.*, col. 1, lines 32-35 and col. 5, lines 60-65. The system disclosed by Mee includes two piezoelectric strips and one induction loop for each lane of traffic. The strips and loops produce signals which are used to determine the likelihood that a vehicle will proceed to an intersection. The signals are further used to predict when the vehicle will be in a position in the intersection to produce an accurate photograph with the vehicle centered in the field of view.

In fact, there is no indication in the Mee reference that the time of the offence will be shown in the photograph. The processor may be configured to capture a time stamp of the event. *See* col. 5, lines 55-56. Mee does not discuss, however, including the time in the photographic record. The contents of the photograph are only mentioned in column 7, lines 47-49 which reads “film line annotations may be written on frames taken.” Since Mee does not even specifically mention that the time will be shown in the photographic record, Mee is not concerned with synchronizing the clock of the system with an exact time and other problems addressed by the present invention.

Moreover, the only synchronization operation mentioned by Mee is an internal synchronization of the various electrical signals from the piezoelectric sensors, the traffic light

signal, and the sensors from the loop detector. Synchronization of such signals eases the microprocessor's burden processing the sensor signals used to control the photography operation. *See* col. 7, lines 54-57. Such a synchronization operation has nothing to do with the claimed synchronization.

Awada likewise fails to disclose or suggest transmitting a synchronization signal forming an indication of the exact time as called for by claim 1. Awada instead discloses a system for locating a vehicle and displaying a speed limit in the vehicle for the determined location. *See* Abstract. The system uses GPS signals to determine the location of the car and a database to retrieve the speed limit at that location. *Id.* The actual speed of the car may be compared to the speed limit to generate a warning in case of speeding. *Id.* The database may be in the car or located remotely. If the database is located remotely, the vehicle will transmit a request through the cell phone antenna, and the cell phone signal may be used to calculate the actual vehicle speed. *See* col. 3, lines 16-22. Thus, Awada does not relate to a traffic monitoring system. Awada does not even include any discussion of synchronizing an internal clock with the real time in the outside world other than the normal use of a GPS system as described in column 3, lines 36 to 48.

In fact, Awada teaches away from a combination with Mee because Mee and Awada are directed to entirely different systems and objectives. Mee is directed to accurately timing a photographic system to capture a vehicle in an intersection. By contrast, Awada is directed to determining a vehicle location and indicating a speed limit to the driver for the determined location.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Mee and Awada, taken individually or combined, do not render obvious independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons noted above.

Claims 6-11

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mee and Awada. Independent claim 6 relates to a system for performing operations similar to claim 1. Claim 6 calls for a system for monitoring traffic including at least one clock and a synchronizer adapted (a) to receive a synchronization signal, (b) compare the signal to the time of the clock, and (c) adjust the time indicated by the clock if different from the signal. Claim 6 is respectfully submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as noted above with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 7-11, which depend from claim 6, are allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner has rejected the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mee and Awada. In addition to the reasons above, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-5 and 7-11 are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 2 calls for a navigation satellite transmitting a synchronization signal. Claim 7 calls for a navigation satellite for transmitting a synchronization signal to a synchronizer wherein the synchronizer is adapted to determine a location from the received signal. For the reasons above, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a satellite periodically transmitting a synchronization signal as called for by claim 1. At least because the Mee and Awada fail to teach or suggest such a satellite and synchronization signal, Mee and Awada can not disclose or suggest a navigation satellite as called for by claims 2 and 7.

Claims 3 and 8 call for adjusting a time value based on a synchronization signal. For the reasons above, the cited art fails to teach or suggest any adjustment of time based on a synchronization signal as called for by claims 1 and 6. At least because the Mee and Awada fail to teach or suggest such an operation, Mee and Awada can not disclose or suggest further adjustment of time based on location as called for by claims 2 and 7.

CONCLUSION


All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extension of time or additional claims, and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (Order No. 067670-5001-US).

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 11, 2008

By: 
Victor E. Johnson, Reg. No. 41,546

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, California 94105
Tel: 415.442.1000
Fax: 415.442.1001